



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/994,047	12/19/1997	DAVID LEE GARRISON	33500-00001	6069

7590

04/09/2003

ANTONELLI, TERRY STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

32

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

08/994,047

Applicant(s)

GARRISON ET AL.

Examiner

Akiba K Robinson-Boyce

Art Unit

3623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 28.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11, 13-27, 29.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

TARIO R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3623

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: First, the applicant argues that the final rejection issued 1/28/03 is improper since, according to applicant, new grounds of rejection have been applied against claim 14 and has been rejected on grounds other than those asserted in the rejection of claims 8 and 15. However, claim 14's rejection is based on the same limitations as the rejection for claim 18 and therefore is not considered new grounds. Specifically, the rejection of both claims address verifying that the received information, which includes account numbers, conform to the validation rules and if not, altering the data to standardized (i.e. normalize) the data so that it conforms to the validation rule. In addition, the applicant argues that Haimowitz et al fails to disclose various items that were argued previously in the communication filed 11/15/02. These arguments include that the hash code does not correspond to the 11-digit zip code since the hash code does not include the street address or building number. However, Haimowitz et al discloses the street address in Col. 4, lines 41-45. In this instance, the building number is the same as an address since both determine destination. In addition, the applicant argues that the payee record is not located. However the payee record is located in Haimowitz et al by first receiving new records in Col. 3, lines 48-53, that include a zip code in Col. 3, lines 1-2, where the zip code is generated from the address information in Col. 3, lines 65-67, Col. 4, lines 6-10, 11-14 and 42-5 if the zip code is missing or incorrect, and a hash code is then generated and later used to access the record using the other information and the zip code validated from the zip code database in Col. 5, line 47. In addition, the applicant argues that the entity that provides a "zip code" is the payor and not the payee. However, as explained in the final rejection, the fact that the records are directed to a "payee" is not patentably significant since the record's possession does not confer patentable weight to the underlying process. Finally, the applicant argues that Haimowitz never suggests the use of a name in generating a zipcode. However, the utilization of a name to generate the zipcode is shown in Col. 2, lines 61-Col. 3, line 2 and Col. 3, lines 65-67 and Col. 4, lines 6-10, and 11-14, where the database of existing customer records can include the customer name. The generation of a zipcode occurs when data from the existing records is validated, normalized by comparing to a Zip Code table to make sure that the data corresponds to the standards listed.